



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

NIKOLAUS P. W. ALMASSY

Serial No. 09/672,359 (TI-31690)

Filed September 28, 2000

For: TELEPHONE PERSONAL INFORMATION MANAGER

Art Unit 2683

Examiner James D. Ewart

Customer No. 23494


Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

2683
#11C
fd
6/2/04

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2004

Technology Center 2600



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that the attached document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or is being facsimile transmitted on the date indicated below:

5-17-04

Jay M. Cantor, Reg. No. 19,906

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Sir:

Responsive to the Office action dated April 7, 2004, please amend the above identified application as follows:

11/05/2004 LEADIE 00060014 200660 09672359

01 FEE1200 15.00 00
02 FEE1300 055.00 00

REMARKS

Claims 1 has been amended and claims 42 to 44 have been added. Claims 1 and 4 to 44 are now active in this application. The allowability of claim 13 to 21 and 33 to 38 is noted with appreciation. Please charge any costs to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

New added claim 42 is essentially a combination of claims 1, 12, and 13, claim 43 is essentially a combination of claim 1, 12 and 14 and claim 44 is essentially a combination of claims 24 and 33.

Claims 1, 4 to 12, 22 to 32 and 39 to 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennen et al. (U.S. 5,329,578). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously stated, all of the claims require that all of the claimed operations take place at least at the mobile station as opposed to a central or base station as appears to be the case of Brennen et al. This feature permits the subscriber to alter any or all of the claimed features at the mobile station rather than having this function performed at the central or base station and thereby provides the obvious advantages inherent in such capability. In Brennen et al. it is necessary to communicate with the central or base station in order to provide the desired programming whereas the subject invention as claimed allows these functions to be made totally at the mobile station or in combination with the mobile station and another remote location. No such concept is taught or even remotely suggested by Brennen et al.

Claim 1 requires providing a mobile station and, at the mobile station the step of creating a plurality of message response groups. No such step is taught or suggested by Brennen et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 43 includes the features of claims 1, 12 and 14, claim 14 having been indicated to be allowable in combination with the claims from which it depends. Also, the arguments presented above with reference to claims 1 and 12 are incorporated by reference.

Claim 44 includes the features of claims 24 and 33, claim 33 having been indicated to be allowable in combination with the claims from which it depends. Also, the arguments presented above with reference to claim 24 are incorporated by reference.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)